Open moder

110-57

1957

Fobruary 26

Honorable Paul G. Karkavelas Senate Chamber State House

Doar Sonator Karkavelas:

This is in response to your verbal request of February 26, for our opinion as to the constitutionality of a proposed amendment to the liquer law (RSA 181) which would restrict direct or indirect control or ownership in establishments holding wholesale liquer permits to persons who have been residents and voters in this state for three years. The full text of the proposed amendment is as follows:

*131:9a Residence Requirement. No porson shall through stock ownership, interlocking stock ownership, interlocking stock ownership, interlocking stock ownership, interlocking directors, or otherwise, have an interest or central, either direct or indirect, in the business of the holder of a wholesaler's permit unless he has been a resident and voter of the state for three years prior thereto. The provisions of this section shall not apply to the renewal of existing wholesale parmits by the holders thereof at the time of the passage of this act.

It is the opinion of this office that the proposed amendment is constitutional. The classification of individuals as residents and non-residents, or votors and non-votors, is generally held to be reasonable in connection with the liquor laws and to satisfy the requirement of equal protection of the law. See Francis v. Fitapatrick, 129 Conn. 619, 30 A2d 522. Annotation 145 ALR.

The draft of your proposed amondment is

returned herowith.

Very truly yours,

NEW HAMPSHIRE LAW LIBRARY

OCT 0 1 1998

Elmor T. Fourque Assistant Attorney General

CONCORD, N.H.

ETB/T